

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed February 24, 2005 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 21, 26 and 45 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicant believes this change is inherent in the difference between a home domain and a domain associated with a NAS. The text of claims 2-5, 9, 13, 22-24, 27-29, and 46-48 and 50-71 is unchanged, but their meaning is changed because they depend from amended claims.

Claims 6-8, 10-12, 14-20, 25, 30-44 and 49 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicant retains the right to present claims 30-44 in a divisional Application.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 5, 13, 21, 25, 26, 45, 49, 51, 53-56, 58-61 and 63-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Perkins<sup>1</sup> This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.<sup>2</sup>

Claim 1 as amended makes clear that the home domain contains no IP addresses in common with the domain associated with the NAS. Perkins fails to teach such an element.

The Office Action concedes that the term "domain" indicates a set of actual network addresses. The Office Action further alleges, however, that the "home domain" in Perkins (set of IP addresses of all the global gateways) is distinct from "domain associated with the NAS" (set of IP addresses for the local gateway) because the "home domain" would contain IP addresses above and beyond those contained in the "domain associated with the NAS). Claim 1 has been amended make clear that the "home domain" and the "domain associated with the NAS" would not have any IP addresses in common, which Perkins does not teach. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,159,592

<sup>2</sup> Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As to independent claims 21, 26, and 45, these claims contain elements similar to that as described with respect to claim 1 above. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

As to dependent claims 2, 5, 13, 29, 51-56, 58-61, and 63-71, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 3, 9, 23, 28, 47, 57 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Perkins in view of Holt et al.<sup>3</sup>. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent claims 3, 9, 23, 28, 47, 57 and 62, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

---

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,070,192

The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 4, 24 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Perkins in view of Holt et al., and further in view of Inuoe et al.<sup>4</sup>. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent claims 4, 24, and 48, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

The Third 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 22, 27, 46 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Perkins in view of Holt et al., and further in view of Reid et al.<sup>5</sup>. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent claims 2, 27, 46, and 50, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,442,626

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,233,616

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

5/12/05



Marc S. Hanish  
Reg. No. 42,626

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040